Comments Received on draft Ventura County MS4 Permit December 27, 2006

From: Tom Leary, Storm Water Program Officer
Department of Public Works - Stormwater Management Division
City of Long Beach

To: RWQCB-LA

Date: March 7, 2007



CITY OF LONG BEACH

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

333 West Ocean Boulevard . Long Beach, CA 90802

VIA FACSIMILE, INTERNET

March 7, 2007

Mr. Xavier Swamikannu Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board 320 W. 4th Street, #200 Los Angeles, CA 90013-2343

SUBJECT: COMMENTS ON PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS FOR MUNICIPAL STORM WATER DISCHARGES WITHIN THE VENTURA COUNTY WATERSHED PROTECTION DISTRICT, COUNTY OF VENTURA AND THE INCORPORATED CITIES

THEREIN, (NPDES NO. CAS004002).

Dear Mr. Swamikannu:

This letter serves to comment on the draft National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) permit and waste discharge requirements for storm water discharges from the MS4 within the Ventura County Watershed Protection District, County of Ventura and the incorporated cities therein dated December 27, 2006.

In order to facilitate review of the comments, they are written in summary format:

- Using Municipal Action Levels from a national database or any other numeric limit to quantify Maximum Extent Practicable (MEP) is problematic and inappropriate.
- Incorporating TMDL Numeric Waste Load allocations into a MS4 Permit is contrary to the recommendations of the State's Blue Ribbon Panel and inappropriate.
- The added specific concentration levels for chlorine/bromine, chloride, cyanuric acid, e.coli, enteroccocus, and fecal coliform for swimming pool/spa discharges, decorative fountains, mobile pet grooming and trash container leachate are onerous and inappropriate.
- Fiscal Reporting requirements and watershed participation requirements are onerous and inappropriate.
- Minimizing pollutants from impervious surfaces to less than 5% of the total project area is too restrictive and prescriptive.

Mr. Xavier Swamikannu March 7, 2007 Page Two

- Expansion of SUSMP requirements to include streets, roads, highways & freeway construction and the reduction in size to 5,000 square feet for industrial /commercial development is onerous and inappropriate.
- Low Impact Development (LID) should have a phased in approach and the costs associated with adopting an LID strategies should be substitutive not additive.
- LID needs to be more clearly defined and that definition should be added to the glossary.
- The LID Technical Guidance Document and Training Program development should not occur until after peer review and publication of the SMC LID study. Implementation of LID methods should not be required until approved by the Executive Officer.
- Development of an Inspection and Tracking System for Post-Construction BMPs and an Electronic Site Tracking System are duplicative, onerous and inappropriate.
- The mandatory installation of catch basin debris excluders is too prescriptive, does not address design and or procurement issues, has an unrealistic installation timeline, does not incorporate a cost/benefit analysis or address O&M costs, provides no guarantee of trash reduction, and may impair flood control protection.
- The requirement to obtain coverage under the General Construction Permit, within 7 days, of the adoption of a new Order for long-term maintenance programs, including but not limited to maintenance of flood control channels, maintenance of streets, sidewalks, roads and any other CIP project that disturbs 1 or more acres is duplicative, onerous and inappropriate.
- The trash receptacle deployment requirement is too prescriptive, does not address design procurement issues, has an unrealistic installation timeline, does not incorporate a cost/benefit analysis or address O&M, and provides no guarantee of trash reduction.
- The proposed grading prohibitions during the wet season (October 1 through April 15) are onerous and inappropriate.
- The Erosivity Factor required in the Development Construction Program is not defined nor is there a way for the Permittee to determine if it's reasonable, implementable and/or enforceable.
- Municipal potable water supply system discharges should remain conditionally exempt.
- The Pyrethroid Insecticides Study requirement is onerous, not based on sound science, has no cost/benefit analysis and should be deleted.
- Pollutants of Concern (POC) are referenced in several sections, however, not clearly defined.

Mr. Xavier Swamikannu March 7, 2007 Page Three

- Pollutants of Concern (POC) are referenced in several sections, however, not clearly defined.
- Should the requirement to inspect industrial facilities remain then the Permittee should be reimbursed a minimum of \$300 per inspection.
- The Ambient Water Quality monitoring surcharge should be eliminated.
- A minimum of one year is need to submit changes, adds or deletes to the statement of legal authority, update stormwater management programs (manuals, training programs, websites), protocols, and practices.

City staff will be present at the Public Workshop on April 5, 2007 at the City of Burbank Council Chambers and will be available to answer questions and/or provide clarifications regarding the content of this letter. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Thomas F. Leary

Stormwater Program Officer

Thomas F. Leavey

TFL:II

cc: Christine F. Shippey, Assistant City Manager Christine F. Andersen, Director of Public Works Mark Christoffels, City Engineer Lisa Peskay Malmsten, Deputy City Attorney